

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,310	09/06/2000	Goro Ishida	04783/016001	9423
22511	7590	10/05/2004	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET HOUSTON, TX 77010			POON, KING Y	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/656,310	ISHIDA, GORO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 1,11,15,28 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amended specification and drawing filed on 7/21/2004 are accepted.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the sentence "requesting print object data to said host device..." intends to mean "sending a request to the host..." and not "sending the print object to the host". Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 11, 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: the sentence "requesting specific print object data to said host device..." intends to mean "sending a request to the host..." and not "sending the print object to the host". Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 15, 32 are objected to because of the following informalities: the sentence "requesting said print object data to said host device..." intends to mean "sending a request to the host..." and not "sending the print object to the host". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 6-10, 23-27, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 6, 23: The claimed limitation of “requesting/requests print object data to be arranged within said divided prescribed partial area to said host ...” It is unclear the limitation means: requesting the print object data to be sent to the host, or requesting the host to arrange the print object data.

Regarding claims 7-10, 24-27: Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because they depend on rejected claim 6.

Regarding claim 36: Claim 36 recited the limitation of “storing these data in a prescribed memory.

It is unclear what “these data” is referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gase (US 6,184,996).

Regarding claim 39: Gase teaches computer readable medium (inherently, programs are stored in a computer readable memory) storing a program (column 3, lines 1-11) for making a printer (14, fig. 1) print the print object data in a host device (10, 12, fig. 1), comprising a processing function for outputting prescribed command data (command of for controlling printers, column 4, lines 20-35) to said printer and receiving prescribed command data (request for printer, column 3, lines 25-30) from said printer, interpreting said received prescribed command data (column 1, lines 10-45, signals must inherently interpreted by the host to understand what the signals are intended for); and performing prescribed processing (responds, column 3, lines 27-30) in accordance with results of the interpreting, wherein said processing function comprises: a setting request function for outputting command data (column 4, lines 20-37) relating to the print setting; and data output means (the programs that reads a print job from an application, column 3, lines 1-10) for reading said print object data from a prescribed storage device (ready for submission, column 3, lines 1-10; i.e., a print job is there, but not being submitted; in order not to lose the print job, there must be a memory for

storing the print job) based on command data relating to the data request sent from said printer, and outputting command data (print data is a command for instructing the printer how to print) relating to data transmission (the print data is transmitted data, column 3, lines 25-30) based on said print object data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-5, 11-17, 35, 37, 38, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pipeline Corporation, The hard copy observer, March 1997 in view of Gase (6,184,996).

Regarding claims 1, 37, 40: Pipeline teaches a printing method with a printer (printer, fig. on page 45) connected to a host device (PDA, Cell pone, computer, etc., fig. on page 45), comprising: receiving first print setting information (setting the printer to periodically access a prescribed list Web site for receiving print objects, 1st column, lines 31-45, page 45, and providing URL's to the printer, column 2, page 45) from a host device (PDA, Cell pone, etc, fig. on page 45); requesting print object data (pages, 1st column, lines 31-45, page 45) to a Web site pursuant to said first print setting information; receiving print object data sent from the web site in reply to said request,

and printing said print object data based on said first print setting information (1st column, lines 31-52, page 45).

Pipeline, does not teach the Web site is the host computer.

Gase, who uses his invention to improve on Pipeline's printing system (column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-25), teaches the computer, that a user used to program a printer, is the same computer that the printer used to access a print object (column 3, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include: the host that setting the printer to periodically access a prescribed list Web site for receiving print objects is the same computer that provides the print object.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline, after reading Gase, because the modification is taught by Gase, and is desirable (column 2, line 1, Gase).

Regarding claim 2: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: receiving inquiry information regarding the print setting sent from said host device (column 3, lines 36-67); sending reply information to said host device based on the characteristic information of said printer in reply to said received inquiry information (fig. 2-4); and receiving first print setting information (the user would program the printer after receiving the reply, column 4, lines 20-45) sent from said host device in response to said reply information.

Regarding claim 3: Pipeline further teaches preparing second print setting information (keeping tract of the time, inherent properties when a printer access the host periodically) based on the characteristic information of the first print setting information sent from said host device; and printing the print object data sent from said host device based on said first print setting information and/or second print setting information.

Regarding claim 4: Pipeline teaches when said first print setting information designates printing based on a plurality of print object data (pages, column 2, page 45), respectively requesting said plurality of print object data.

Regarding claim 5: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: specifying print object data in a prescribed order (column 4, lines 25-32, Gase, also see column 2, page 45, Pipeline) based on said first print setting information; and requesting said specified print object data.

Regarding claim 11: Pipeline teaches requesting specific print object data (column 2, page 45) to said host device based on issued management information (periodically access the host is management information).

Regarding claim 12: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: receiving an issuance request of management information (column 3, lines 50-67) sent from said host and issuing said management information in accordance with the print setting information (e.g., description of job, status of job, column 3, lines 50-67, fig. 3, the print job are set according to print setting information) in response to said received issuance request.

Regarding claim 13: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: issuing new management information when the processing related to the printing of print object data sent from said host device is completed (printed, column 3, line 61, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 14: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: releasing the management information of said completed print object data when the processing relating to the printing of said print object data is completed, and sending said released management information to said host device (printed, column 60, line 61, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 15: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: requesting said print object data to said host device upon receiving information (column 3, lines 15-25, column 4, lines 25-37, a user set the printer/sending information to the printer to request a particular job first, inherently, host transmit code to printer and all code transmitted to the printer also contain information of indicating the end of the code) relating to the termination of the print setting from said host device.

Regarding claim 16: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: suspending printing (fig. 3, fig. 4, select a printing job to be cancel) upon receiving print suspension information from said host device while printing said print object data.

Regarding claim 17: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: sending information (status of a print job, column 3, lines

59-62) relating to the termination of print processing to said host device upon suspending said printing.

Regarding claim 35: Pipeline teaches a printer (printer, fig. on page 45) connected to a host device, (PDA, computer etc, fig. on page 45) comprising: first storage means (the program of the printer, column 1, line 31-45, inherently, program code are stored in a memory/storage means) storing its characteristic information (program information); second (inherently properties, a memory unit can either store a 1 or 0; therefore a memory can not store two things) storage means for storing print setting information (the program from user, e.g., periodically access a web site, column 1, lines 31-45) ; reception means (the device that receives user's program) for receiving first print setting information sent from said host device; and setting means (the software that interprets the program and controls the printer to send a request for stock quotes at eight o'clock, column 1, lines 31-45) for converting the first print setting information received by said reception means into second print setting information (keeping track of the time 8 o'clock) based on the characteristic information stored in said first storage means; wherein said printer prints the print object data sent from a web site based on the second print setting information stored in said second storage means.

Pipeline, does not teach the Web site is the host computer.

Gase, who uses his invention to improve on Pipeline's printing system (column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-25), teaches the computer, that a user used to program a printer, is the same computer that the printer used to access a print object (column 3, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include: the host that setting the printer to periodically access a prescribed list Web site for receiving print objects is the same computer that provides the print object.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline, after reading Gase, because the modification is taught by Gase, and is desirable (column 2, line 1, Gase).

Regarding claim 38: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: obtaining characteristic information (fig. 2-fig. 4) of a printer necessary for printing with a specific printer from said specific printer, preparing said first print setting information (column 4, lines 20-35) based on said obtained characteristic information; and sending said prepared print setting information to said specific printer.

11. Claims 18-22, 28-34, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pipeline Corporation, The hard copy observer, March 1997 in view of Gase (6,184,996) and Nagata (US 5,138,696).

Regarding claim 18: Pipeline teaches a printer (fig. on page 45) connected a host device (PDA, computer etc, fig. on page 45), comprising: a processing means (the software of the prnter, PIPS, fig. on page 45) for interpreting (inherently, there must be a software/means to interpreting signals received to understand what the signals are intended for) command data (programming instruction from user, column 1, lines 31-45)

sent from said host device and performing prescribed processing (requesting daily stocks at 8 o'clock, column 1, lines 31-45, page 45) in accordance with the results of the interpreting; printing means (all printers must have a printing means that print images on a recording medium) for executing printing to a print recording medium, wherein said processing means includes: request means (the requesting software that request print pages, column 1, lines 31-45, page 45) for requesting to a web site for the print object data designated by print setting information based on command data relating to the print setting; and a generation means (the program that reproduce 1, or 0's from the electric signals received by the printer) for generating print object data obtainable based on command data relating to data transmission based on print setting information (the printing data must be generated before 8 o'clock).

Pipeline, does not teach the Web site is the host computer.

Gase, who uses his invention to improve on Pipeline's printing system (column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-25), teaches the computer, that a user used to program a printer, is the same computer that the printer used to access a print object (column 3, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include: the host that setting the printer to periodically access a prescribed list Web site for receiving print objects is the same computer that provides the print object.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline, after reading Gase, because the modification is taught by Gase, and is desirable (column 2, line 1, Gase).

Pipeline and Gase does not teach generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory.

Nagata, in the same area of printing, teaches generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory (column 3, lines 12-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline because of the following reasons: (a) bit map data would have instruct the printer what to print at a particular point; and (b) storing would have prevent the print data being lost before they are printed.

Regarding claim 19: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means sends to the host device receiving inquiry information based on its characteristic information (fig. 2-4) in response to command data relating to a print setting inquiry (column 3, lines 36-67); and receives command data (program data) relating to the print setting sent from the host device in response to said reply information (the user would program the printer after receiving the reply, column 4, lines 20-45).

Regarding claim 20: Pipeline further teaches wherein the processing means prepares second print setting information (keeping tract of the time, inherent properties when a printer access the host periodically) based on the characteristic information of the first print setting information sent from said host device; and printing the print object (generating bit map data) data sent from said host device based on said first print setting information and/or second print setting information.

Regarding claim 21: Pipeline teaches when said first print setting information designates printing based on a plurality of print object data (pages, column 2, page 45), said processing means respectively requesting said plurality of print object data.

Regarding claim 22: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: specifying print object data in a prescribed order (column 4, lines 25-32, Gase, also see column 2, page 45, Pipeline) based on said first print setting information; and requesting said specified print object data.

Regarding claim 28: Pipeline teaches wherein the processing means requests specific print object data (column 2, page 45) to said host device based on issued management information (periodically access the host is management information).

Regarding claim 29: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means issues said management information in accordance with the print setting information (e.g., description of job, status of job, column 3, lines 50-67, fig. 3, the print job are set according to print setting information) in response to a command (column 3, lines 37-45) request relating to the issuance request of management information.

Regarding claim 30: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means issues new management information when the processing related to the printing of print object data is completed (printed, column 3, line 61, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 31: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means releases the management information of said completed print object data when the processing relating to the printing of said print object data is completed, and sends said released management information to said host device (printed, column 60, line 61, fig. 3).

Regarding claim 32: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means requests said print object data to said host device upon receiving information (column 3, lines 15-25, column 4, lines 25-37, a user set the printer/sending information to the printer to request a particular job first, inherently, host transmit code to printer and all code transmitted to the printer also contain information of indicating the end of the code) relating to the termination of the print setting from said host device.

Regarding claim 33: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means suspends printing (fig. 3, fig. 4, select a printing job to be cancel) upon receiving print suspension information from said host device while printing said print object data.

Regarding claim 34: Gase further teaches the desired modification to Pipeline's printing system comprising: wherein the processing means sends information (status of

a print job, column 3, lines 59-62) relating to the termination of print processing to said host device upon suspending said printing.

Regarding claim 36: Pipeline teaches A computer readable medium (inherently, all program are stored in a computer readable medium) storing a program (column 1, lines 1-7, page 45) for controlling a printer (fig. on page 45) connected a host device (PDA, computer etc, fig. on page 45), comprising: a processing function for interpreting command data (programming instruction from user, column 1, lines 31-45) sent from said host device and performing prescribed processing (requesting daily stocks at 8 o'clock, column 1, lines 31-45, page 45) accordance with the results of the interpreting (user sending a program/signal and the printer must (inherent) interpret the signal to understand what the user wants), wherein said processing function comprises a request function (column 1, lines 31-45, page 45) for requesting to a web site for the print object data designated by print setting information based on command data relating to the print setting; and a generation function (the program that reproduce 1, or 0's from the electric signals received by the printer) for generating print object data obtainable based on command data relating to data transmission and print data based on print setting information (the printing data must be generated before 8 o'clock).

Pipeline, does not teach the Web site is the host computer.

Gase, who uses his invention to improve on Pipeline's printing system (column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-25), teaches the computer, that a user used to program a printer, is the same computer that the printer used to access a print object (column 3, lines 15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include: the host that setting the printer to periodically access a prescribed list Web site for receiving print objects is the same computer that provides the print object.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline, after reading Gase, because the modification is taught by Gase, and is desirable (column 2, line 1, Gase).

Pipeline and Gase does not teach generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory.

Nagata, in the same area of printing, teaches generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory (column 3, lines 12-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline to include generating bit map data and storing these bit map data in a prescribed memory.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Pipeline because of the following reasons: (a) bit map data would have instruct the printer what to print at a particular point; and (b) storing would have prevent the print data being lost before they are printed.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see office action.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892.

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/22/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "King Y. Poon".